UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,322	03/26/2001	Barry Lynn Royer	2001P04776 US	8854

			EXAMINER	
7590	09/22/2004		NGUYEN, VAN H	

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 May 2004_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
> set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
> patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at
> the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject
> matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

3.   Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bladow et al. (U.S. 6,115,040).

4.   As to claim 1, Bladow teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a

system for use in a first application concurrently operating together with a plurality of

network compatible applications (col.3, lines 10-21), comprising:

an entitlement processor for enabling user access to a first application of a

plurality of concurrently operating applications in response to validation of user

identification information (col.3, lines 30-46).

a communication processor employed by the first application of the plurality of

concurrently operating applications for intermittently communicating an activity

indication (col.3, lines 47-67) to a managing application within a timeout window (col.4, lines 1-6) the activity indication being communicated to prevent an inactivity timeout of the first application being initiated by said managing application in response to the timeout window being exceeded (col.4, lines 18-32 and col.22, lines 5-38).

While Bladow teaches the activity indication being communicated to prevent an inactivity timeout of the first application being initiated by said managing application in response to the timeout window being exceeded. Bladow does not specifically teach "being communicated *sufficiently often*."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have applied the teachings of Bladow to include the features as claimed because Bladow's teachings would have provided the capability for monitoring and controlling a duration of a user session in the access control system.

The fact that Bladow's teachings "to enable a software to detect client sessions...the client application using the client session object "heartbeats" every predetermined period...failure to "heartbeat" for consecutive predefined period...result in the expiration of the session key" (col.22, lines 5-38) and purpose of using the client session object "heartbeats" every predetermined period in Bladow suggests "being communicated *sufficiently often.* "

5.   As to claim 2, Bladow teaches intermittently communicating an activity indication prevents an inactivity timeout of the plurality of concurrently operating applications of a particular user initiated session (col.22, lines 5-38).

6.   As to claim 3, Bladow teaches the communication processor stores a plurality of

activity indications and sends the plurality of activity indications as a batch to the

managing application (col.13, lines 1-17).

7.   As to claim 4, Bladow teaches the user action comprises, among other things,

mouse and keyboard activities (col.15, lines 3-4).

8.   As to claim 5, Bladow teaches the first application and the managing application

reside in the same PC and the activity indication notifies the managing application of

activity by the first application and includes, among other things, a session identifier for

identifying a particular user initiated session (fig.6).

9.   As to claim 6, Bladow teaches the communication processor intermittently

communicates activity indications to the managing application using a plurality of

different commands including an activity notification command and a command

involving, among other things, sending a URL to the managing application (col.18, lines

15-17).

10.   As to claim 7, Bladow teaches the communication processor communicates to the

managing application a request to receive an activity indication associated with the first

application and maintained by the managing application, the activity indication indicating

time since the last activity update (col.17, lines 23-41).

11.   As to claim 8, Bladow teaches individual applications of the plurality of

concurrently operating applications independently intermittently communicate an activity

indication to the managing application (col. 3 and 30-46) and a browser application

providing a user interface display permitting user entry of identification information for

validation by the entitlement processor (fig.6 and associated text).

12.   As to claim 9, Bladow teaches the communication processor communicates a

time-out threshold value comprising the timeout window to the managing application

(col.22, lines 5-24).

13.   As to claim 10, Bladow teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a

system for use by a managing application supporting concurrent operation of a plurality

of Internet compatible applications (col.3, lines 10-21), comprising:

an input processor for intermittently receiving activity indications from a

plurality of concurrently operating applications (col.3, lines 30-46);

a comparator for comparing individual activity status indicators with

corresponding time-out threshold values to identify an application time-out event

indicated by a status indicator exceeding said time-out threshold (col.22, lines 12-24);

and

a communication processor for communicating notice of said application time-out

event to one of said plurality of concurrently operating applications (col.22, lines 25-38).

While Bladow teaches an activity monitor monitors individual activity status

indicators, corresponding to said plurality of concurrently operating applications, in

response to said received activity indications (col.4, lines 18-32 and col.22, lines 5-24),

Bladow does not specifically teach "updating individual activity status indicators."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have applied the

teachings of Bladow to include the features as claimed because Bladow's teachings

would have provided the capability for keeping track of all the client applications, and

enabling the client applications to interact with one or more Web enabled remote

services.

The fact that Bladow's teachings "identifies the cookie for the session and updates

the heartbeat time... send the status back to the client platform process" (col.17, lines 23-

40) and purpose of updating the heartbeat time in Bladow suggests *"updating individual*

activity status indicators."

14. As to claim 11, Bladow teaches the activity indications received by the input

processor are provided in response to a user action (col.14, lines 56-67) and the user

action comprises, among other things, mouse and keyboard activities (col.15, lines 3-4).

15. As to claim 12, Bladow teaches an activity status indicator comprises a time

indication identifying when activity of a particular application was last reported, and the

time-out threshold comprises a predetermined time duration and the managing

application determines the particular application to be inactive if the time indication

exceeds the time-out threshold (col.22, lines5-38).

16. As to claim 13, Bladow teaches the input processor receives activity indications

from a plurality of different commands including an activity notification command and a

command involving, among other things, sending a URL to the managing application

(col.18, lines 15-17).

17. As to claim 14, Bladow teaches the communication processor communicates

notice of the application time-out event to applications of the plurality of concurrently

operating applications that have previously requested a notification of session termination

(col.22, lines 5-24).

18. As to claim 15, Bladow teaches the communication processor communicates

notice of the application time-out event in response to, among other things, a received

communication from an application session having previously produced a time-out event

(col.3, line 57-col.4, line 3).

19.   As to claim 16, Bladow teaches the activity indication includes, among other

things, an identification of particular user initiated session (col.3, lines 32-40).

20.   As to claim 17, Bladow teaches a common timeout period for the plurality of

concurrently operating applications (col.4, lines 1-12).

21.   As to claim 18, Bladow teaches a predetermined default value for the time-out

threshold values (col.22, lines 5-38).

22.   As to claim 19, the rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full.

Additionally, Bladow further teaches a browser application (col.13, lines 1-17)

23.   As to claim 20, Bladow teaches the activity indication notification includes,

among other things, an identification of particular user initiated session (col.3, lines 32-

40).

24.   As to claim 21, Bladow teaches a common timeout period is used as the inactivity

timeout for the plurality of concurrently operating applications (col.4, lines 1-12).

25.   As to claim 22, it includes the same subject matter as in claim 10, and is similarly

rejected under the same rationale.

26   As to claim 23, note the rejection of claim 1 above. Claim 23 is the same as claim

1, except claim 23 is a method claim and claim 1 is a system claim.

27.   As to claim 24, it includes the same subject matter as in claim 10, and is similarly

rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

28.   Applicant's arguments filed May 30, 2004 with respect to claims 1-24 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

27.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

        - Nason et al. (U.S.6677964) teaches "Method and system for controlling a

complementary user interface on a display surface."

        - Shrader et al. (U.S.6195097) teaches "Web-based DCE management."

28.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 306

-5971. **After mid-October, 2004, the examiner can be reached at (571) 272-3765.**

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM.

The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678.

        The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VHN

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
                    CENTER 2100